

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the present application. The Examiner maintains the rejections of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Nitahara (U.S. Patent No. 6,604,108) and Basani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,361), however in the present Office Action, the Examiner now applies Basani as the primary reference instead of Nitahara.

With respect to independent claim 1, it was previously argued that neither Nitahara nor Basani, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least, “receiving main home page data from a source server in which home page data to be moved is stored,” as recited in claim 1. *See Amendment dated July 21, 2005.* In the present Office Action, the Examiner cites the same portions of Nitahara as set forth in the previous Office Action as allegedly satisfying the above-quoted feature of claim 1, and the Examiner also now cites col. 2, lines 32-53. Further, the Examiner states, “the home page is sent from the content server “source server” to the information mart server “home page moving device.”

In response, Applicant submits that nowhere does Nitahara disclose or suggest at least that the information mart server, which allegedly corresponds to the claimed home page moving device, performs the specific operations of “extracting data requiring modification from the received data,” and “converting the extracted data into a format suited for a destination server by referring to a mapping table for storing mapping relationships,” which are the operations of the home page moving device as described in claim 1. The Examiner alleges, at the top of page 3 of the present Office Action, that, “the information mart server determines the attributes of the content required from the retrieved page and whether additional attributes are required.”

However, nowhere does Nitahara disclose or suggest that the information mart server performs the specific ‘determination’ operation described above. Yet further, contrary to the Examiner’s assertions on page 3 of the Office Action, nowhere does Nitahara disclose or suggest that the information mart server performs the operation of transforming acquired data into a format compatible with a receiving device; Nitahara teaches that a file type of a received content file is determined at the browser level, and then an appropriate application is launched. Therefore, it is clear that there is no conversion, at the information mart server, of data into a particular format, as the browser has the functionality of accepting many different formats and can launch appropriate applications therefor.

Therefore, at least based on the foregoing as well as the arguments submitted in the previous Amendment, Applicant maintains that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Nitahara and Basani, either alone or in combination.

Applicant submits that independent claim 4 is patentable at least for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 8, Applicant maintains that the applied references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least, “a data converter for converting the home page data stored in the source server into a format suited for the destination server by referring to the mapping table,” as recited in claim 8 and as similarly argued above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2, 3, 5-7, and 9-11 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

Further, with respect to dependent claims 2, 3, and 6-8, the Examiner does not even respond to the specific arguments that were previously submitted with respect to these claims. Applicant maintains these same arguments.

At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-11 are patentable over the applied references, either alone or in combination.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

Date: January 3, 2006